

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were rejected in the Office Action dated March 3, 2009. Claims 1, 7, and 15 are currently amended. Claim 4 is canceled without disclaimer.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-13, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,856,787 to Itkis ("Itkis"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,762,552 to Vuong et al ("Vuong").

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Itkis and Vuong as applied to claim 1-13 and 15-20 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,621,814 to Stepan et al. ("Stepan").

Claim 1 previously recited, in part, "a single processor configured to access the memory to execute the machine readable game code to concurrently offer a game to the first player at the first game terminal and the second player at the second game terminal."

Itkis teaches a system with multiple processors, with a master game device (disclosed to be a general purpose computer presumably comprising a processor) and numerous "slave" devices each comprising a processor 10.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection under the Itkis reference. In doing so, the Examiner reiterates that Itkis "teaches...a single microprocessor, which executes game codes stored in the master device." Office Action at page 3. The Examiner also indicates that arguments in the previous Response filed 12/15/08 are not persuasive (Office Action at page 7, *Response to Arguments*), but fails to discuss or address processor 10 of Itkis. It is not understood how the Examiner's arguments regarding a processor in figure 1 device 1 (Office Action page 7, *Response to Arguments*) put forth to support the proposition that Itkis discloses "a system

...comprising...a single processor” can be reconciled with microprocessor 10 disclosed to be part of each slave game device.

Itkis explicitly teaches that “The slave game device presented in FIG. 2 is an intelligent (smart) game terminal comprising the microprocessor 10.” Col. 2, lines 57-59. See also microprocessor 10 in Figure 2 of Itkis.

The Examiner is kindly requested to reconcile this discrepancy if the rejection is to be maintained.

Claim 1 has nevertheless been amended to facilitate allowance.

It is respectfully submitted that Itkis, alone or in combination with Vuong, fails to teach the claim 1 limitation as amended of “a central processor remote from the first game terminal and the second game terminal and configured to access the memory to execute the machine readable game code to concurrently offer a game to the first player at the first game terminal and the second player at the second game terminal, the first and second game terminals relying on and sharing the central and remote processor to execute the machine readable game code, and lacking a processor within each of the terminals.”

Itkis, alone or in combination with Vuong also fails to teach the independent claim 7 limitations, as amended, of “a control module having a single processor for controlling the system and configured to execute software code, the software code configured to generate the first and second wagering events; two or more game terminals operated by the single processor of the control module for controlling the system and configured to concurrently present the wagering events generated by the single processor for controlling the system, the first wagering event to a first player and the second wagering event to a second player...”

Additionally, Itkis, alone or in combination with Vuong also fails to teach the independent claim 7 limitations, as amended, of “A method for utilizing and sharing a processor to control two or more game terminals and present two or more games to two or more players: providing a single shared processor configured to read and execute game code stored on a memory; executing the game code with the single shared processor to generate a first wagering event; executing the game code with the single shared processor to generate a second wagering event.”

Therefore, Itkis, alone or in combination with Vuong and Stepan cannot properly render obvious independent claims 1, 7, and 15, and all the claims that depend therefrom. All the pending claims are thus submitted to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance and an early indication of its allowance is solicited. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/Peter Mikhail/

Peter G. Mikhail
Reg. No. 46,930

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
510-663-1100